

# THE CORRESPONDENT.

*Magna est Veritas et Prevalebit.*

VOL. I.

NEW-YORK, JULY 14, 1827.

NO. 25.

## MISCELLANEOUS.

For the Correspondent.

### APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS.

(Continued.)

**Simon**—I am astonished, O Emperor, that thou regardest with any consideration this ignorant man, a sinner, and a great liar ; who is neither distinguished for his eloquence, nor by his family, nor any ability.—But, no longer to be annoyed by this adversary, I will command my angels, and they shall come and shall take vengeance on him.

**Peter**—I fear not thy angels, but they shall fear me, acting by the virtue and power of my Lord Jesus Christ, who thou falsely pretendst to be.

**Nero**, (to **Peter**)—Thou fearest not Simon, who sheweth his divinity by his works ?

**Peter**—The divinity resteth in him who searcheth the secrets of hearts ; if then the divinity is in him, let him now say what are my thoughts, and what I shall do. Before he shall say what I think, I will whisper it in your ears, that he may not belie my thoughts.

**Nero**—Tell me of what thou thinkest.

**Peter**—Give order that a barley loaf be given me, and that it be brought under cover. ‘ And when he had commanded that it should be brought and given unto Peter, Peter having taken the bread, broke it, and concealed it under his mantle.’

**Peter**—Let him now say what I have thought, what has been said, and what has been done.

**Nero**—Wouldst thou then have me convinced, because Simon is ignorant of these things, he who hath restored the dead to life, and who having been beheaded, appeared again the third day, and has done all things which he said he would do ?

**Peter**—But he has not wrought them before me.

**Nero**—He has in my presence performed all these things ; for he called his angels before him and they came.

**Peter**—Since he hath done so great things, why doth he not that which is less ? Let him say what I thought and what I did.

**Nero**—What sayest thou, Simon ? I know not how to determine between you.

**Simon**—Let Peter make known my thoughts.

**Peter**—I will make it appear that I know the thoughts of Simon, provided I shall be allowed to do that of which he shall have thought.

**Simon**—Know, O Emperor, that no one divineth the thoughts of men, but God only.

**Peter**—Thou then, who callest thyself the Son of God, tell my thoughts ; explain, if thou canst, that which I have just done in secret.

Now Peter had blessed the barley loaf which he had received, had broken it, and had placed it under his right and left skirts. Then Simon, enraged at not being able to divine the apostle’s secret, cried aloud :—Let huge dogs come forth and devour him in the presence of Cæsar ! And instantly there appeared dogs of enormous size, and they rushed upon

*Peter.* But Peter stretching forth his hands to pray, shewed to the dogs the bread which he had blessed.—

And the dogs no sooner saw the bread, than they disappeared.

*Peter (to Nero).*—Ye see how I have shewn that I knew the thoughts of Simon, not by words but by facts, for having threatened to bring angels against me, he has caused dogs only to appear, by which it is evident that he had not at his command the angels of God, but of the dog.

*Nero, (to Simon).*—How is this, Simon ? I think we are outdone.

*Simon.*—He hath performed these things often in contending with me in Judea, in all Palestine, and in Coesaria. This is why he charges me with counteracting him. He therefore says this as an evasion. For, as I asserted, none can penetrate the thoughts of men, but God alone.

*Peter, (to Simon).*—Thou liest certainly in calling thyself God, or why canst thou not make manifest the thoughts of each one.

*Nero, (turning to Paul).*—Paul, why art thou silent ?

*Paul.*—Be aware, O Cæsar, that if thou allow this Magician to do such extraordinary things, a great evil will befall thy country, and by his means the government will fall from its present state.

*Nero.*—What sayest thou Simon ?

*Simon.*—If I proclaim it not openly that I am God, not one will render me the homage due to me.

*Nero.*—And wherefore dost thou delay, and shewest not thyself to be God, that these men may be punished.

*Simon.*—Give orders that there be a tower of wood erected for me ; and I will ascend thereon, and will summon my angels, and I will command them in the presence of all the people, that they bear me to my Father

in Heaven. As these men cannot do likewise, thou wilt be convinced they are deceivers.

*Nero, (to Peter).*—Hast thou heard Peter, what Simon hath said ? By this it shall appear which hath the greatest power, he or thy God.

*Peter.*—Most worthy Emperor, if thou wert willing, thou mightest know him, for he is full of the devil.

*Nero.*—To what conclusion can I come, amidst these subterfuges ?—The day after to-morrow your pretensions shall be put to the test.

*Simon.*—Thinkest thou, gracious emperor, that I am a magician, after having been dead, and returning to life ?

For the crafty Simon had accomplished by his illusions, what he had said to Nero : “ Command that I be beheaded in darkness, and that I be left dead ; and if I rise not again the third day, pronounce me to have been a Magician ; but if I come again to life, acknowledge me to be the Son of God.” And as Nero had commanded that this should be done in obscurity, he so contrived by his magic, that a ram was beheaded, which appeared to be Simon. This having been done in the dark, when he who had severed the head, had examined and carried it to the light, he found it to be the head of a ram ; but he would not tell the king for fear of betraying himself ; for he had been ordered to perform the operation in secret.

It was to this then that Simon had alluded, when he said he had risen to life on the third day ; for he had removed the head and body of the ram, and the blood had coagulated in that place. And the third day he discovered himself to Nero, and said, “ Examine my blood which hath been shed, and behold that I have been beheaded, and that I am risen again

on the third day, as I promised."— Then when Nero had said, the day after the morrow shall decide between you, turning to Paul, he saith,—"How Paul, why answerest thou nought either as to where thou hast been taught, or who hath been thy master, or how thou hast taught in the cities, or what disciples thou hast made to thy doctrines? For to me it seems thou hast little knowledge, and canst do no great works."

To be continued.

For the Correspondent.

MR. OWEN.

*Philadelphia, June 30th, 1827.*

**Mr. Editor**—On Monday last, Mr. Owen delivered a lecture to a numerous and respectable audience, at the Franklin Institute, in this city; the delivery of which occupied three hours. His object was to remove the erroneous impressions, industriously circulated by his enemies, relative to the Social System, and to show some of the evils arising from the Individual System. On my return home, I noted down the principal facts and arguments, together with a few of my own remarks, which I should have sent you ere this, had I not been told that the whole discourse is taken down by a first rate stenographer; but not knowing the truth of this, and thinking that the stenographer might not do Mr. Owen justice, on account of his *heterodox* opinions, I have thought proper to send you as much as will occupy one sheet, which you, perhaps, will have the goodness to insert, as early as convenient, in your useful paper.

Mr. Owen commenced by saying, that since he addressed them the last time, he had had to encounter many difficulties, attended with much expenditure, perhaps eighty or a hundred thousand dollars, but at the

same time, he had acquired that knowledge, which would be of the highest value to mankind, and which knowledge he would not exchange for the most splendid crown and all the wealth in the world. He next commented on the mental degradation all over the world, not excepting the United States; that this mental degradation arose from the individual system, mystery and falsehood in religion, and belief being deemed a merit, and disbelief a demerit; and that these produced antipathies, persecutions and religious wars. He said, in all the countries where he had been, he had in vain sought for charity; he had sought for it among the Friends, (Quakers,) but he could not find it there; and he had concluded it was not to be found under the individual system. He said we were taught insincerity and falsehood during our infancy; and how was it to be expected that we should not possess it when we grew up? He appealed to the respectable females present, if they had known children under their care, guilty of lying and insincerity before they formed associations with those who were guilty. He then noticed the feuds that exist among the Friends, (Quakers.) He expected good would arise from them, as there were no class more mentally degraded (among freemen,) than they were. They were nothing like what the Friends were 150 years ago.

He also made some observations on the differences existing in this city, between the mechanics and artizans and their employers, respecting the long hours of labor, required by the latter,—that short hours of labor was equally for the benefit of the employer and labourer. How he illustrated this, my memory is not sufficient to inform you; but from all

these differences he expected much good would arise. He hoped that the laboring class would have *a free press of their own*. He next adverted to the injurious mode in which mechanical power is applied. "Machinery," said he, "instead of being brought in aid of human labor, is put in competition with it. That master has made, and is making rapid strides in the old world, and it is doing the same *here*. In England, formerly, a man by working nine hours a day, could live in health and comfort; but in consequence of machinery, the number of hours was increased to ten, then to eleven, then to twelve, and now, (if we may credit both public and private accounts from that country,) *they must work sixteen hours a day, and are unable to obtain a sufficiency of even the coarsest food and clothing*. By machinery, England was enabled to carry on the wars against France,—by it she is at once the most wealthy and the most miserable. Machinery requires neither food nor clothing, and but a very trifling expense, and against this flesh and blood has to contend.\* England, Ireland, and Scotland have a population of 25 millions. This population, with machinery, can manufacture for double the population of the world," (eight hundred millions.)

Mr. Owen next made some remarks on the mode of living: "Some persons," he observed, "must have very large houses, to be occupied with splendid furniture, that they may appear to as great advantage in ex-

travagance, as their neighbours.—Their articles of eating and drinking must be the rarest and the most costly. The expense has to come out of the mechanic and labourer; for if the rich had to toil for their own food, clothing, furniture, houses, &c. they would be the most miserable of beings, and of what use would be their riches?" The dress of females he considered not only injurious to health, but to good feelings, as tending to create arrogance, antipathies, and jealousies; and also, as producing the like evils in their children.

At this part of the discourse Mr. Owen requested any one to start any objections, or ask any questions they might think proper. A gentleman then solicited an account of the state of the colony at New-Harmony, when Mr. Owen read a statement from the *New-Harmony Gazette*, which was highly gratifying, notwithstanding their many unforeseen difficulties. It appears that the original colony at New-Harmony, is discontinued; the members have formed other colonies, contiguous to the old one, where they have organized their particular, and, perhaps, final associations; that is, they unite with those whose dispositions, language, opinions, &c., are in accordance with their own. All new comers go on to the original place, and then proceed to some one of the colonies.—Before Mr. Owen left New-Harmony, he signed the bond for the tenth colony.

Another gentleman rose and requested some explanation of the cause which had unfortunately produced the difference between Mr. Owen and Mr. M'Clure. This Mr. Owen attributed to his pursuing a different system of education to that of Mr. M'Clure. He also represented Mr. M'Clure as possessing

\* Mr. Owen might have made the remark, that machinery makes beggars of the laborers, and gives princely fortunes to their employers; thus destroying both the mental and political degradation of the former, and enabling the latter to accumulate wealth, to oppress and to destroy the right of suffrage of the poor man.

an uneven temper, and as capable of being acted upon by others. The differences between them were put to arbitration, and the arbitrators awarded Mr. Owen 5,000 dollars, which he received, and when Mr. Owen left N. H. he called on Mr. M'Clure, and they were on good terms. He said Mr. M'C. had done much good, and no doubt would do much more. When Mr. O. left New-Harmony, he knew nothing of Mr. M'C's. advertisement.

A gentleman, an universalist, next rose and said he approved of the social system, but that he could not agree that Mr. Owen was the author of it. Jesus Christ was the author; it was he who had taught us "to love one another," and to "love our enemies."\* Mr. Owen said, "tell me not

of charity in your books; I want to see it in practice. Where is the charity of the Christian for the Jew; that of the Jew for the Christian; that of the Jew and Christian for the Mahometan? Where is the charity of these three for the Brahmin?" He insisted that as belief was deemed a merit in *all* religions, they were all opposed to the social system, inasmuch as that pretended merit produced antipathies, persecutions, and wars. He also contended that it was impossible our belief could be subject to our will.\* The gentleman did not reply to Mr. Owen in this; but when Mr. O. spoke of the persecution for a difference of opinion, the gentleman said he would speak his mind any where; that he loved all men, and this he got from the bible. He then inveighed against *his brethren*, "the orthodox," so called, and insinuated that they gave a wrong interpretation to the bible.

Mr. Owen was next presented with a note, requesting his opinion on the marriage ceremony. He said he considered the present marriage ceremony highly injurious to society. "It was absurd to compel people to make a declaration that they will love, as though they possessed the power of loving and hating at pleasure; that we cannot make our affections, where there is no affection; there must be quarreling, and this must furnish a bad example to the children. If I

\* Mr. Owen might have asked, had he had time, (he had then spoken two and a half hours) was it social to drive the money-changers out of the temple? Was it social to refuse a man permission to bury his father, and to "let the dead bury the dead?" Was it social to say that "he (Jesus) came not on earth to send peace, but a sword?" Was it social to say that he should be rewarded who should forsake *father* and *mother*, and sisters, and houses, and lands, for his (Jesus') sake? Was it social to say "he that believeth shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned?" Was it social to call those who differed from him in belief, fools, blind guides, serpents, hypocrites, &c., and threaten them with hell fire? In all these, and many other cases, where was the good feeling and sociability of Jesus? Or where have been the social consequences arising from his system? Have they been hanging, drowning, quartering, roasting, &c. Let the inquisition, St. Bartholomew's day, Smithfield, the numerous, long and bloody wars against the "infidels," and even among the different Christian sects: let the Catholics, and Protestants, and Arians, who perpetrated these horrid murders and refined cruelties on each other, because they differed in belief; and let the determined, though silent, persecutions in our own country, speak. The man who can say that the Christian system is a social one, must either be ignorant of facts, or possess a bold face.

\* If our belief is subject to our will, why persecute us for it? If it is not, I would ask, can a Methodist believe the doctrines of Calvin, or a Calvinist in that of Wesley? Can a Protestant believe in the Catholic doctrine, or a Catholic in that of a Protestant? Or can a Christian believe in the doctrine of Mahomet? If they cannot, (which they must admit) then how can belief be subject to the will.—Every man who has a belief, thinks that his is the right one. If he did not, he would think it erroneous; and if he thought it erroneous, he would change it.

were to take a partner, I would not say I will love you, but I would say, I will endeavor to be as kind and as affectionate to you as I can."

JULIAN.

For the Correspondent.

**LIFE OF SAMUEL.**

(Continued from No. 22.)

In Samuel chapter 2d, ver. 25th, it is said :

"But Eli was very old ; he learnt what his sons did ; he reproached them but the would not hear him, because God would destroy them." What a wicked and perverse thought to harden people in order to slay them ! But to whom did God tell his thoughts ? Was it to man only ; to the priest who repeated it ? Have we not a right to attribute it rather to the bearer of the message, to the self stiled interpreter ? It is clear that this did not come from God, but from a Jewish mouth ; from the heart of a fanatic and ferocious Hebrew, full of the passions and prejudices which he attributes to his idol. But to return—"Samuel advanced in years, and increased in favor with God and with man." Here all the translators are in error : they make Samuel a child ; whereas the Hebrew word *nar* signifies a young man and may apply to one twenty or twenty five years old. The proof of this is that the text applies it to the squire who accompanies Jonathan in one of the boldest military enterprizes ; to David when he is presented to Saul as a subject strong and fit for war ; and to the servants of the priest who speak of taking the flesh by violence. All the applications require the age of twenty years at least.

Samuel could not have been less than that at the time we speak of ; and he may have been twenty four judging from a calculation of his life ;

for, a little after, we see Eli perish very old. Twenty years and seven months after, Samuel commences his own judgeship, and continues until he becomes old enough to wish to substitute his children. He had lived about eighteen years under Saul. Finally he dies very old. Suppose he had twenty years of administration, then those eighteen years, then twenty between his accession and the death of Eli, would give fifty-eight years.

We cannot give him less than twenty or twenty two years at the death of Eli to make up seventy-eight or eighty years which his life requires.

At the age of twenty, Samuel was already capable of much calculation and reasoning. He had been bred amid all the conversations, all the complaints, all the intrigues, all the projects of the sacerdotal circle in which he lived ; he had heard wishes often expressed to see the children of Eli excluded ; to see appear one of those men of God sent from time to time to save the people of Israel. He well knew what was necessary for a man of God. Why should he not consider himself fit to play that part ? The rest of the story enlightens us on this question.

In the meanwhile a singular circumstance happens : a man comes to find Eli, he reproaches him in the name of Jehovah, or Jehuh, with the prevarications of his children : he announces to him that they shall not succeed him, and that Jehuh has chosen another, a faithful priest. I will cut off, says God, thine arm (that is thy power) and the arm of thine house, so that it shall have no more old men. The sign that I shall give you is that thy two sons Hophni and Phineas, shall die on the same day ; and I will raise me up a priest after

my own heart, and my mind, to govern all his life. The people that are left of thy house shall crouch before him begging for money and bread, and to be employed in the service of the temple. In this account we have first a conversation divulged. But by whom? Eli would not have boasted of it; it was the man of God who made it known. What interest had he to prepare the minds for a change desired by many, even by the greatest number? In his quality of prophet and preacher, this man of God must have known the successor announced. Might he not act already in concert with him? His prediction is found to be in favour of Samuel. Might not Samuel play a part in this affair? The axiom rightly says: He has done it, who had an interest to do it. Should it not have been Samuel in this case? Observe that Eli was blind, and that any one might have spoken to him, and he not have known the person. There is here the management of knavery. Samuel is not impeached, but he is arraigned. As to the prediction against the two sons of Eli on the same day, it is evident how easy it was to the writer or copyist to interpolate afterwards. So much for the first process verbal.

In chap. 3d. we learn that Samuel served God near to Eli. [he did the service of the temple] The word of the Lord was rare in those days; he appeared no more in visions. The eyes of Eli were obscured; he saw no more. It happened one night that Eli was in his bed, the lamp was not extinguished, and Samuel was also in bed in the temple of the God Jehuh, where the holy ark was, and God called Samuel who ran to Eli and said here I am—you called me. No says Eli, I did not call you, go back and sleep. This was repeated

the second and third time, when Eli, apprehending that God called him, told him if God called him again to answer: speak Jehuh thy servant hears. So Samuel returned to bed and the God Jehuh came and stood upright and called Samuel twice, who answered, speak, thy servant hears. To shorten the story, it is sufficient to say that the same predictions were repeated which were spoken to Eli; that is, in consequence of the backslidings of his sons and his backwardness in restraining them, the Lord had supplanted his house, and would substitute a stranger in the supreme power. Next day, Samuel remained silent on the subject, but Eli obliged him to tell the whole. After hearing it he contentedly said, "It is Jehuh (the master) let him do what is good in his own eyes."

Now to appreciate this narrative, I do not intend to reason on its leading features: God comes into a chamber—stands upright before a bed,—speaks as a person of flesh and bones. What should I think of a person who would believe such a fable? I shall confine myself to the conduct and character of Samuel. And first, I demand who saw, who heard all that was said, who related it, who made it public? It could not be Eli; it could be only Samuel, who was actor, witness, and narrator. He alone had an interest to invent and promulgate. Without him, who could have specified the minute details of this adventure? It is evident that we have here a scene of phantasmagoria, resembling those which took place among the ancients, in the sanctuaries of the temples, and for the responses of the oracles. The young adept was encouraged to it by the physical and moral feebleness of the high priest Eli; perhaps by the instigation of some person concealed

behind the curtain, and having intercalculated, and we shall see on the ests and passions which we cannot now ascertain; though it is most probable that Samuel trusted to no one. What remains to be afterwards seen of his dissimulation, seems to

fix the balance on this side. Divulging was not so difficult; he might have been satisfied with the confidence of a servant, a devoted friend; an old or a young priestess, that the apparition of God, the oracle of the holy ark might be rumored about, acquiring from mouth to mouth an intensity of certitude and belief.

"But Samuel increased (says the text) and God was with him and none of his words fell to the ground; and all Israel knew that he was become a prophet of God: and God continued to appear in Shiloh." As to the word *prophet*, the historian tells us, that at this epoch the Hebrew term *nabia* was unknown: that the word *nah* was used, which signifies *seer*. Here then we have a posthumous writer, who connected at pleasure, the memoirs which Samuel or some other cotemporary had composed. It pleased him to set down as a positive fact, the belief of all Israel in this fable, while he himself knew nothing of the matter. If we had memoirs of those times from several hands, we should have materials for reasonable judgment. It is said in the text, that for some time the word of the Lord had become scarce, and that there appeared no more visions. Why was this? because there were some incredulous; because there had happened bad examples, false oracles, divulging of sacerdotal knavery, which had awokened the good sense of the higher class among the people. The blind and fanatic credulity remained, as it always happens, among the multitude; it was on them that Samuel

installation of Saul, that he had always against him a party of unbelievers, powerful enough to compel him to use management, and even to oblige him to abdicate.

At the period we have reached, we behold Samuel a candidate on the road to power; the people interested for him, and waiting an opportunity. Eli, quite old is expected to die every moment; time passes, suppose one or two years; Samuel has reached twenty two, or at most twenty four years; a war occurs, and the Philistines, for some motive, declare it. The Hebrews assemble; battle is given at a place called Aphek, the latter are beaten; their devotees propose to bring the ark into the camp, in order that Jehu may destroy the Philistines. They, frightened at first, take courage; cut the Hebrews in pieces, take the ark, carry it into their country, and subject all Israel to a tribute. In this battle the two sons of Eli are slain, the old man remains at Shiloh, learns on his high place of judge, the whole disaster, and struck with despair, he falls over, breaks his neck and dies. The seat is vacant, and open to Samuel; but his nice prudence judges the moment too stormy, he retires without noise to his own country, hoping not without reason that the unfortunate people, vexed by the enemy, would not be long in wishing to receive a liberator. This however, was procrastinated, and Samuel had leisure to prepare the means which would bring him effectually on the stage. That which passed in the interval does not relate directly to him, but as it presents a lively image of the spirit of the times, it deserves to be noticed here.

The ark of the God of the Jews, was in the profane hands of the Phi-

listines. This people might have profited by the opportunity to destroy the talisman, which had so often frightened them ; but at this time superstition was universal, and among all nations the priests had a common interest to maintain it, lest contempt for a strange deity, should lead their ferocious warriors to examine too closely their own idol. The ark is respected, the priests of the Philistines place it in the temple of their God Dagon, in the city of Azot. The following day on rising, the people of Azot found the idol Dagon, fallen upon its face [the posture of adoration] before the ark ; but they raised it up and replaced it. The next day they found it fallen again, but this time the hands and the head were separated from the body, and placed on the threshhold of the temple. Whence, I would ask, came this act of audacity and secret knavery ? Did some Jew introduce himself into the city with that artifice, that pick-pocket stratagem of which the Arabs and the peasants of Egypt and Palestine give, even in our days, astonishing examples ? This might be possible ; fanaticism might lead to it. The temple had no sentinels ; it was even open, and decisive victory might have banished all vigilance. On the other hand, might it not have been the priests of Dagon who resorted to this knavery from the motive already pointed out ? Their subsequent conduct, altogether partial, renders this extremely probable.

The people of Azot could not believe their God so powerless as to be treated so by human force ; they would say, " it is Dagon himself who declares his will, who shows his respect for his brother the God of the Jews ; he did not wish to hold him captive." The alarm spreads the priests announce some calamity, the

effect of the celestial anger, an epidemic disease of the intestines, takes place, [in that country ruptures and dysenteries are common ;] then an eruption of rats and field mice was very destructive. The people are confounded, all is attributed to the captivity of the ark, they demand its release, the inhabitants of another town where they take it, learn the motive, and become alarmed, the disease spreads by contagion, and terror thus becomes general. Finally, after seven months delay, the military chiefs of the Philistines call before them their priests and divines, and demand of them what they shall do with the ark ? It was proposed to burn it ; but mark the reply : they advise not only to send it back, but also to offer an expiatory offering for the sin of the warriors. These, (as is commonly the case) not less credulous than brave, ask what offering should be given ? The priests reply " make five golden emorods and five mice of gold according to the number of your principalities, to appease the God of the Hebrews. Why have you hardened your hearts like the king of Egypt ? you have been smitten like him ; send away also the ark of the God of the Hebrews." Here the spirit and system of the priests are evident ; they nourish the public credulity, in favor of their particular power, at the expence even of the interests of their own nation. Is there not reason to believe that the trick played by Dagon, came from their hands.

(To be continued.)

For the Correspondent.

#### ADDRESS TO CHRISTIANS.

*Christians* :—You believe the Bible to be the word of God ; but are you acquainted with this fact, that what a man *believes* he does not

*know?* Can any man say he *believes* the sun shines when his eyes behold it? Certainly not; he *knows* it; consequently where there is faith there is no knowledge; and where there is knowledge, there is no faith. Faith and knowledge will not go hand in hand. You believe that the first man, by eating forbidden fruit, brought death into the world and all our woe; You believe that by Adams transgression all were made sinners and became objects of the eternal wrath of their maker, unless they repent and believe on Jesus, to be the propiciation of their sins. If they comply with this condition, you believe they will become heirs of God to an inheritance to be enjoyed eternally. You may *believe* all these, with thousands of other things; but bear in mind, whatever you believe you do not know. To you then there is no certainty.

You will acknowledge faith to be the production of evidence on our senses; and, if so, I will ask you what are the proofs that produce in you the belief of these things? You answer, that you have the word of God for it. But do you know that? We believe it, you say, and have sufficient reason so to do, for we have the testimony of holy inspired men, who confirmed their testimony by miracles, and sealed it by martyrdom. But this you do not know; you have it second hand. You did not see them work miracles, and they do not tell you that they did. Some body said so; but you cannot tell who it is. I will refer you to one instance, to show that those you say testify, do not say any thing, and that it cannot be discovered who it is that speaks. Turn to the Gospel said to be according to John, the last chapter and 24th verse:—"This is the disciple that testifies these things, and *we* know that

his testimony is true." Here the writer of this Gospel, in trying to make John the author, has discovered the deception by saying *we* know that his testimony is true; which plainly shows that John was not the author. But if we allow that the writers of the scripture did work miracles, healed the sick, cast out Devils, raised the dead, &c. does that prove that they were inspired of God? If so, the witch of Endor, the magicians of Egypt, and numerous others were equally inspired. If the working of miracles proved a man to be inspired, and put the truth of what he says beyond a doubt, then Mahomet was inspired, and so was the author of the Persian Bible and the Hindoos also. Every one, indeed, who has endeavored to establish a new religion, is deserving of credit, for they all invariably endeavor to prove their authority from God, by working miracles.

Christians! In selecting your Bible from all others, and condemning the rest as the impositions of crafty priests, did you first examine them all with care. No. There is few of you that has seen any other Bible than the one you adore; and I presume to say the half of you have never read that through. You were born in Christian land; your parents and priests have told you from your infancy to believe your Bible, or you would be damned; and you, like the slaves of a despot, dare not question the truth of such holy men. If you would but exercise the divine gift of reason, you would not believe that a book, which contains so many contradictions, could have been written by the command and inspiration of a just, a merciful, and a righteous God.

I cannot close this communication, without inserting a few observations delivered by the Rev. Mr. Yates, Missionary at Calcutta, before the

American Bible Society, at its late anniversary in Boston. His object, he says, was to show the moral wretchedness of the heathen, and the folly and wickedness of their books, which they venerate as the highest wisdom. I hold, says he, in my hand, books which have been regarded as Bibles in different parts of the world. The first is the Shastra of the Hindoos. I have read it, he continues, and can testify from such examination, that it is more calculated to promote the misery than the happiness of man here.—He says, the God Vishnu is represented as teaching his disciple Arjun, to enter on the murderous deeds of war, and enforcing his exhortation by arguments that destroy all human responsibility, and beget in the soul a morbid indifference to the nearest connections in life. Here the God represents himself as being the author of all those bloody deeds that have spread desolation over the face of the earth. "How" exclaimed this reverend, "does the Bible appear, when contrasted with such a system?" At some future time, I shall disclose the contrast, or rather compare them, and let the reader judge, whether the Bible of the Christian is worthy of such encomium. Respecting the second, he says, it is the Desatir, the Bible of the Persians. It ascribes some perfections to God that are worthy of him; but it contains no information how a guilty sinner is to obtain pardon and eternal life. The third, he says, is the Koran, the Bible of the Musselman. It is received as a divine revelation by as many people as our scriptures, (he might have said a great many more) and by the comments upon it, you may judge how greatly it is admired. The best part of it has been taken from the old testament, and some parts that have not, are in direct opposition to the Gospel. Christ has said, *love your enemies*, but the false prophet says, *kill them*. The objects most to be pitied are thus devoted to destruction. G.

## The Correspondent.

*Magna est Veritas et Prevalebit.*

NEW-YORK, JULY 14, 1827.

*The Antidote.*—Having from the commencement of our editorial labors, denied, and we do still deny, the *authenticity* of the Bible, and the *existence* of the person called Jesus of Nazareth, it is obvious that all discussions of topics drawn from that book, or of doctrines said to have been taught by that individual, unless to shew their pernicious tendency, could be regarded by us in no other light than as romances. What we considered *destitute of all direct proof* could never be supposed entitled to our credit, far less be admitted as *correct data*, on which to erect a system calculated to promote human happiness. Without some point had been agreed on from which to start; unless our opponents had given us *unquestionable* proofs that their system was true, it would have been a waste of time, and an annoyance to our readers, to continue contending with chimeras and with phantoms of the brain.

It was under these impressions that we entered the lists with the *Antidote*, when its Editors announced it to be their intention to carry on "*a constant and rigid warfare with the Correspondent.*" So explicit and unqualified a challenge could not be mistaken. Its authors must have been aware of the nature of the opinions which we have all along promulgated. They must have known, if their challenge was intended to

mean any thing, and if they calculated on victory, that it was incumbent on them to turn their attention to something else than points of faith ; that it was not enough to assert that the Bible was an inspired book ; that miracles had been performed ; that millions of human beings had lived and died in the faith of these, and of the divine mission of Jesus, when the *authenticity* of the very writings, which they offered as proofs of these facts, was distinctly denied. So far, however, from this being the intention of these men ; so far from combatting us with that "honest zeal" of which they so loudly boasted in the outset, it has been their constant study to draw our attention from the only legitimate object of discussion, the only topic on which, with antagonists like us, there was room for displaying their vaunted prowess—*Antidote* after *Antidote* appeared, filled with bombastical and fanatical declamations on subjects which no rational being could comprehend, and containing assertions utterly destitute of even the appearance of probability ; while every thing in the *Correspondent* really essential to the cause at issue, was studiously and pertinaciously avoided.

Finding, in consequence of our repeatedly urging them to pursue a correct course, that they could no longer persist in that which they had hitherto followed : the Editors of the *Antidote*, notwithstanding their lofty vaunting, the high tone with which they proclaimed interminable war against the *Correspondent*, and modestly boasted of their talents to write us down ; have, in their last number, virtually acknowledged, that they are unable to obviate the objections, which we have repeatedly urged against the *truth* of their religion, and the *personal identity* of its al-

leged founder. They say, indeed, that they may, probably, attempt this in their own way, at some distant period, when the *Antidote* has obtained general circulation ; and in the meanwhile they loudly call on men of talents to aid them in this undertaking. But what could be a more distinct avowal of their own inability to defend their cause, than this language. At first, these braggards entered the field as *assailants*—threw down the gauntlet for us—challenged us to take it up—boasted of their great strength and resources. No sooner do they find themselves compelled to change their position, and to act on the *defensive*, than they decline the combat which they themselves had originated, and tacitly admit, that they had taken the field without calculating on the consequences of their presumption.—Whether the period ever arrives when the conductors of the *Antidote* will enter on a fair and candid discussion of the "grounds and reasons" of their religion, we know not. But if it should, they will find us as ready as ever to enter the lists with them. The cause of truth, however, and the respect which we owe to our numerous and intelligent readers, must necessarily exclude from the *Correspondent*, all discussions founded on mere assumptions. Although our pages are open to "temperate and sober reasoning," we can never forget the pledge we gave in our prospectus, that we should "recognize nothing to be true that is incapable of proof or demonstration."

We had written thus far, when we received the annexed communication of *Philo Veritas*, which although rather out of place, we insert here, because it is appropriate to the point under consideration, and well calculated to render the discussion with

the *Antidote* useful and interesting.—If *utility* is their object; if they have opened the campaign in defence of *truth*; and if they are really its “zealous and honest” champions, let them embrace the opportunity now given of making good their pretensions, or for ever remain stigmatized as wilful supporters of error—as deceivers, whose sole object is to perpetuate mental slavery, that they may live in affluence and ease at the expense of those who labour.

To the Editor of the Correspondent.

SIR:—I am glad to find that you have an opponent in the *Antidote*. The authors and editors of that work are hereby challenged to a discussion of the following points, or any of them: I premise, that the rule of controversy every where is *affirmantis, est probare*: those who assert, are bound to the proof. Also, that in any case where it is (without proof) alledged that a fact *might be* so or so, it is a sufficient reply that it *might not be* so and so:—

1. The Jews were never known as a nation till they were subjected by the Romans. No ancient author mentions them. The falsehoods of Josephus on this subject, are examined and refuted by Wytténbach, whose dissertation in reply to Josephus I will send you a translation of, if needed.

2. The Pentatuch was not written by Moses—it is full of anachronisms.

3. The prophet Ezekiel, and (*pari ratione*) the other prophets, existed only after the Babylonish captivity.

4. There is no historical recognition of any part of the Jewish scriptures, by heathen or christian writers, till the citations of the Septuagint by the later fathers. The Septuagint itself is clouded in its origin by the falsehoods and forgeries of Aristœus;

and by the variance between the Hebrew and Samaritan texts; of whose respective dates there is no evidence whatever. Hence there is not a particle of evidence for any part of the Old Testament prior to 500 years after the supposed birth of Christ.

5. There is no evidence whatever for the existence of Jesus. Our present gospels were published promiscuously among fifty other acknowledged forgeries. The older fathers contain passages like some of the texts in our present gospels; but whether taken from them or the forged ones, does not appear by any circumstance hitherto known.

6. There is no mention made of, or any citation made from our present gospels by name, till 1600 years after the Christian era. Suppose any modern author were now, for the first time, to give an account of a miracle-working prophet in the reign of Charles I., who would believe him?

7. The ancient fathers were the most ignorant, the most stupid, the greatest falsehooders and forgers by profession and on principle, as many of them have published of themselves, of any class of writers now known to history—knaves as utterly unworthy of credit by *their own showing*.

8. They not only forged spurious gospels and interpolated the scriptures, but they have done the same with Josephus, Longinus, and Pliny the younger.

Will the authors of the *Antidote* pitch upon any of these points of discussion, and discuss it with me?

PHILO VERITAS.

#### FOURTH OF JULY DINNER.

In our last, we had only room for the oration, the address of the President, and the toasts given from the chair, at the celebration of the anniversary of our independence by the

members of the *Free Press Association*. On the health of Lord Cochrane, as connected with the affairs of Greece, being drunk, the Secretary of the Association addressed the company as follows :—

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen—The name of Thomas Cochrane, whose health has just been drunk, is worthy, indeed, of being associated with the cause of Grecian liberty. From a personal acquaintance with this champion of the rights of man, I know him to be as generous as he is brave—as incapable of mean or dishonorable conduct, as the most virtuous patriot whose name is enrolled in the annals of history. I know him, also, as the foe of clerical as well as political usurpation—the advocate of liberal principles, the disinterested friend of man. As a husband and a father, I have witnessed on his part the most endearing attentions; and in private circles no man who wished to obtain friends, or to stand well with those he had obtained, could conduct himself with greater urbanity. It is true, though a nobleman by birth, and heir to the titles of one of the most ancient earldoms in Great Britain, the “privileged” class of that country despise him for his *plebeian* notions of liberty, and his unceasing and dauntless attacks on corruption. In the navy, where he had an important command for many years, he discovered innumerable abuses, over which his lofty and independent mind would not allow him to draw a veil. In disclosing these abuses, he implicated a friend of the Lord Chancellor of England, whose situation, as chief maritime judge, enabled him to fatten on the immense wealth, which flowed into the English ports by the numerous captures that were made by their cruizers during the last war.

This conduct could not fail, in a government so unprincipled as that of Great Britain, to raise up a host of powerful enemies against the gallant Cochrane; and what tended to increase their envy the more, was the popularity he acquired by the splendour of his naval achievements. He captured, burnt and destroyed the most important remains of the French fleet on their own coasts, and almost within sight of those of his own country. He stormed their forts, cannonaded their towns, swept their harbors—cut out their ships of war, took their merchantmen, and run the convoying vessels ashore where fire and water soon destroyed them. His actions in Basque Roads were so splendid and so prosperous, that they form one of the most brilliant recollections of the naval history of Great Britain. No wonder that a Captain brave even among the bravest—skilful in his combinations and designs—successful in almost every undertaking—and yet most considerate in regard to his crew, was dreaded by the enemy, and adored by all British seamen.

But in a few months the banner which a grateful country had deposited to his honor in the most illustrious of her sanctuaries—among the ashes of warriors, of statesmen, and of philosophers—was rudely plucked from its socket, torn, by base hands, from its high estate, and trampled, together with his escutcheon, under foot—low in the dust that was conscious of the bones of a hundred heroes. In a few short months, the undaunted courage—the lion port—the unsleeping energy—the devoted patriotism—the boundless services of this great and brave man were forgotten and despised; and neither the exultations of the enemy, rejoicing in his fall—nor the honest zeal of the sailors who

had become familiar with victory under his flag—nor the wounds he had dealt to a powerful and dangerous foe—nor the considerations due to his rank—nor the respect which such talents and such heroism would have commanded in any other age or country, could exempt him from the last dishonor, or avert from him the pollution of forced infamy.

And what, let me ask, was the dreadful—the horrible—the atrocious crime; which brought down such terrible punishment on the head of this bravest of men. The charge, gentlemen, which his enemies preferred, was what, if a crime, might have been preferred with more justice against thousands in England, who were never called to account for their conduct. He was accused of undue influence to raise the price of the public funds. For this he was dragged before a tribunal composed of his most deadly foes, convicted on the evidence of perjured villains, hired and paid by these very foes, and sentenced to the most disgraceful punishment which the law inflicts on the most notorious criminals.

Now, gentlemen, if you feel indignant at such base—such unprincipled—such ungrateful treatment—what must you think when I tell you, and I have a perfect knowledge of the fact, that Thomas Cochrane was as innocent of the offence charged against him as any who now hear me? Yes, gentlemen, and there are thousands who know the fact as well as I do, that Thomas Cochrane had not the smallest participation in the transaction, which, in the hands of his enemies, was so basely made the pretext of his degradation. A foul conspiracy was concocted, and the whole influence of the government, aided by the public treasury, and by fanaticism, was bent towards the destruction of a man, whose virtues formed too

striking a contrast with the vices of those in power, not to render him a constant object of their abhorrence. With such fearful odds to contend, it would, indeed, have been a matter of astonishment had he escaped from the snare which the cunning of his persecutors had laid for him. With a bursting heart, and under such indignation as none but the suffering brave can feel, the gallant Cochrane fled from his native country, after protesting in vain against the severity of his sentence, and the extent to which these vindictive proceedings had been carried. He offered his services to the infant states of our southern continent, then in the very struggle for existence. Here he was not slow in rendering his name as illustrious as he had before made it in Europe. He ensured success to the republic whose quarrel he espoused, He wreaked upon the armaments of Spain in those distant seas the vengeance with which the countries that were once her colonies had entrusted him. He sailed on from victory to victory, and approved himself on the Spanish Main, equally great as a military and as a naval commander.

I know that much abuse has been directed against Cochrane by the press of this country, for the alledged severity of his proceedings while on the South American station.—He has been accused of capturing and detaining our merchant vessels improperly, and denounced a “pirate and marauder.” But what completely refutes those charges is the fact that in no instance has any of the transactions alluded to, led to reprisals, or as far as I know, called for a remonstrance on the part of our government. If men, regardless of the laws of nations, will embark in an *illicit* trade, they have only themselves to blame for the consequences.

Having assisted the Brazilians as far as he considered it proper, we now find the hero Cochrane embarked in the glorious cause of liberty in Greece. Already he has succeeded by his great prudence, in extinguishing those internal feuds which have so long retarded the emancipation of this once flourishing and delightful country—This I am inclined to consider a presage, that the enterprize, on which he has entered with so much alacrity, will be attended with the same success that has hitherto crowned all his efforts in the cause of humanity; and that while the names of a Liverpool, a Castlereagh, a Scott, and an Eldon, his most inveterate persecutors, are consigned to oblivion, that of a COCHRANE will stand for ever emblazoned on the page of history.

The following were volunteer toasts.

By A. C. MOREY.—The day we celebrate. The first anniversary of *Mental Independence*.

By A. SANBORNE.—Every man who is bold enough to be honest, and honest enough to be bold.

By JOHN BRUCE.—Prosperity attend the School of *Practical Education*. May it grow in the estimation of the public, until all are convinced of its utility.

By ROBERT L. JENNINGS.—The Female Republicans of every country.

By GEO. HOUSTON.—Robert Owen, the patron of liberal principles.

By ROBERT L. JENNINGS.—Frances and Camilla Wright. May their voluntary privations in the cause of suffering humanity, be richly repaid by their final success in their attempt to emancipate mankind from ignorance and slavery.

By JOHN C. FORT.—The friends and supporters of liberal principles and free governments throughout the world.

Besides the above, the following volunteers were given in the course of the evening:—

The Chairman of the Free Press Association.

The Orator of the Day.

The Editor of the Correspondent.

The Printers of the Correspondent.

Mr. Crellin, and thanks for the sumptuous dinner he had provided.

Messrs. Wiggins and Pearson, who had so promptly and politely accommodated the Association with the use of their rooms during the celebration.

#### To our PATRONS.

As only *one* number remains to be published to complete the first volume of the *Correspondent*, we would respectfully remind our patrons, that, agreeably to our original terms, the subscription for the next half year will then fall due; and as it is desirable to save the expense of *collecting*, which bears heavy on the establishment, it is hoped that all who feel interested in our success, will order payment at our office.

We regret to state, there are some (though they are not numerous) who have received the *Correspondent* from the commencement, who are still in arrear for the *first half year's* subscription. If payment is not immediately made, their papers will be discontinued at the close of the present volume.—Although our success has been equal to our expectations, and the *Correspondent* may be considered as *permanently* established, we cannot afford to furnish it for *nothing*, even should there be any individuals on our list so unreasonable as to expect this.

\*\*\* Subscribers who intend binding the *Correspondent*, can have this neatly done to any pattern, and at a moderate price, by sending to the office of publication, corner of Vesey-street and Broadway.

*Ecce Homo!*—This work is now completed, and for sale at the office of the *Correspondent*; price 75 cents in boards. Regular subscribers to the *Philosophical Library*, who have not received the 2d and 3d. Nos. of that work, (being the concluding parts of *Ecce Homo!*) are requested to apply as above.